arXiv:1411.7087v4 [math.LO] 6 Jun 2016

CONSISTENCY PROOF OF AN ARITHMETIC WITH SUBSTITUTION INSIDE A BOUNDED ARITHMETIC

YORIYUKI YAMAGATA

Abstract. This paper presents a proof that a theory of bounded arithmetic of Buss's hierarchy is capable of proving the consistency of a system based on Cook and Urquhart's equational theory of a feasible arithmetic from which induction has been removed but retains substitution. This result improves Beckmann's result which proves consistency of such a system without substitution inside a bounded arithmetic of Buss's hierarchy.

Our proof relies on the notion of "computation" of the terms that appear in the theory of Cook and Urquhart. In our work, we first prove that, in the system under consideration, if an equation is proved and either its left or right hand side is computed, then there is a corresponding computation for its right or left hand side, respectively. By carefully computing the bound of the size of the computation, the proof inside a bounded arithmetic of this theorem is obtained, from which the consistency of the system is readily proven.

This result apparently implies separation of bounded arithmetics because Buss and Ignjatović stated that it is not possible to prove the consistency of such a system in the weakest theory of Buss's hierarchy. However, their proof actually shows that it is not possible to prove the consistency of the system, which is obtained by the addition of propositional logic and other axioms to a system such as ours. On the other hand, the system we considered is strictly equational, which is a property on which our proof relies.

This paper is revised version of the paper titled "Consistency proof of a feasible arithmetic inside a bounded arithmetic" which was posted to ArXiv. This paper revises the previous paper in the two aspects: One is that it fixes the problem in the proof which causes Beckmann's counter example. Another is that it strengthens the meta-theory, still within the Buss's hierarchy of bounded arithmetic, which is used to prove consistency, to avoid the complicated calculation.

§1. Introduction. Ever since Buss showed the relation of his hierarchy of bounded arithmetic $S^i_2, i = 1, 2, \ldots$ to polynomial-time hierarchy of computational complexity [3], the question of whether his hierarchy is collapsed at some $i = n$ or not, has become one of the central questions of bounded arithmetic. This is because the collapse of Buss's hierarchy implies the collapse of polynomial-time hierarchy. In particular, $S^1_2 = \bigcup_{i=1,2,\ldots} S^i_2$ (the right hand side will be denoted by S_2.) implies $P = NP$, because S^1_2 characterizes polynomial time-computable functions P.

A classical way to prove the separation of theories is the use of the second incompleteness theorem of Gödel. If it is proved that S_2 proves the consistency of S^1_2, $S^1_2 \neq S_2$ is obtained, because S^1_2 cannot prove its own consistency.

Unfortunately, Wilkie and Paris showed that S_2 cannot prove the consistency of Robinson arithmetic Q [10], a much weaker system. Although this result stems more from the free use of unbounded quantifiers than from the power

of arithmetic, Pudlák showed that S_2 cannot prove the consistency of bounded proofs (proofs in which the formulas only have bounded quantifiers) of S_2^1 [8]. The result was refined by Takeuti [9] and Buss and Ignjatović [4], who showed that, even if the induction were to be removed from S_2^1, S_2 would still not be able to prove the consistency of its bounded proofs.

Thus, it would be interesting to delineate theories which can be proven to be consistent in S_2 and S_2^1, to find a theory T that can be proven to be consistent in S_2 but not in S_2^1. In particular, we focus on Cook and Urquhart's system PV, which is essentially an equational version of S_2^1. Buss and Ignjatović stated that PV cannot prove the consistency of PV^-, a system based on PV from which induction has been removed. On the other hand, Beckmann [2] later proved that S_2^1 can prove the consistency of a theory which is obtained from PV^- by removing the substitution rule.

This paper presents proof that S_2^2 is capable of proving the consistency of purely equational PV^- with the substitution rule. This result apparently implies $S_2^1 \subsetneq S_2^2$ from that of Buss and Ignjatović. However, their proof actually shows that PV cannot prove the consistency of the extension of PV^- that contains propositional logic and $BASIC^e$ axioms. On the other hand, our PV^- is strictly equational, which is a property on which our proof relies.

The consistency of PV^- can be proven by using the following strategy. Beckmann uses a rewriting system to prove consistency of PV^- excluding the substitution rule. According to the terminology of programming language theory, the use of a rewriting system to define the evaluation of terms, is referred to as *small-step semantics* (referred to as *structural operational semantics* in [7]).

There is an alternative manner in which to perform the abovementioned definition, namely *big-step semantics* (referred to as *natural semantics* in [6]). In big-step semantics, the relation $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ where t is a term, ρ is an assignment to free variables in t, and v is the value of t under assignment ρ, are defined. We treat $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ as a statement in a derivation, and provide rules with which to derive $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$. For technical reasons, it is assumed that such derivations are DAGs (Directed Acyclic Graphs).

However, it is still not be possible to prove the induction step for the substitution rule, because bounded arithmetic cannot prove the existence of a value for each term of PV. The proof requires the introduction of the notion of *development*, a sequence of substitutions with constraints.

Then, we attempt to prove that $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ implies $\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ for any given ρ by induction on the construction of the proof r of $t = u$ under the assumption that r is a sub-proof of a PV^--proof π of $0 = 1$. It is possible to set bounds for all quantifiers which appear in the induction hypothesis of this induction by setting a bound on Gödel number of ρ and bounds on Gödel numbers of the derivation of $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ and $\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$. Because induction is carried out on bounded formulas, the proof can be carried out inside S_2^i for some i. The bound on $||\rho||$ is given by $||\pi|| - ||r||$ where $||\alpha||$ is the number of symbols in α.

The bounds for derivations are more difficult to obtain. First, there is Beckmann's counter example which is presented in Section 6.2. To avoid this difficulty, we allow that a value of a computation can be approximate in the similar way to Beckmann's paper [2]. Next, although it is possible to bound number

of *nodes* in derivations such as the above in a similar way as ρ, bounds for the *Gödel numbers* of these derivations are not trivially obtained, because there are no (obvious) bounds for those terms that appear in the derivations. This difficulty was overcome by employing the *call-by-value* style of big-step semantics, in which a derivation has the form

$$\frac{\langle f_1(\overline{v}),()\rangle \downarrow w_1, \quad \dots \quad \langle f_k(\overline{v}, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}),()\rangle \downarrow w_k, \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(\overline{t}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v.} \tag{1}$$

where () denotes the empty sequence and X be the set of indices i such that t_i is not an approximation of a numeral (g-numeral). Because the numbers of the symbols in $t_1, \dots, t_m$ and $f_1, \dots, f_k$ are bounded by $||f(\overline{t})||$, and the size of the g-numerals appearing in the derivation are bounded by the number of nodes in the derivation, the size of the terms that appear in this derivation can be bound by the number of nodes and the size of the conclusions of the derivation. Thus, an induction hypothesis is obtained of which all the quantifiers are bounded by the Gödel number of π.

The part of the induction step that is most difficult to prove is the soundness of the substitution rule. The proof is divided into two parts. First, it is proven that if σ derives $\langle t_1[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \dots, \langle t_n[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_n$, then there is τ that derives $\langle t_1, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \dots, \langle t_n, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_n$ (Substitution I). Next, it is proven that if σ derives $\langle t_1, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \dots, \langle t_n, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_n$, then there is τ that derives $\langle t_1[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \dots, \langle t_n[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_n$ (Substitution II).

The intuition behind the proof of Substitution I is explained as follows. The naïve method, which uses induction on the length of σ, is ineffective. This is because an assumption of the last inference of σ may be used an assumption of another inference; thus, it may not be a conclusion of σ_1, which is obtained from σ by removing the last inference. Thus, it would not be possible to apply the induction hypothesis to σ_1. Making all assumptions conclusions requires us to increase the length of σ_1 from σ by duplicating the inferences from which the assumptions are derived. Therefore, induction cannot be used on the length of σ.

Instead, we use induction on $||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_n[u/x]||$. Then, we prove that for all $|||\sigma||| \leq U - ||t_1[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_n[u/x]||$ where U is a large integer which is fixed during the proof of soundness, we have τ which derives $\langle t_1, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \dots, \langle t_n, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_n$ and satisfies $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_n[u/x]||$. Because all quantifiers are bounded, the proof can be carried out in S_2, in particular S_2^2.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes the preliminaries. Section 3 introduces PV and PV$^-$, which is the target of our consistency proof. Section 4 introduces the notion of *(approximate) computation* and contains the proofs of the technical lemmas. Section 5 contains the proofs of the consistency of PV$^-$ and the concluding remarks and discussions are presented in Section 6.

§2. Preliminary. The sequence $a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n$ is often abbreviated by $\overline{a}$. the notation $\#\overline{a}$ is used to refer to the number of elements in $\overline{a}$, which is n. We denote the empty sequence by () in the meta-language.

Many kinds of objects are considered as proofs of PV, terms of PV, or the *computation* of these terms, all of which require the assignment of Gödel numbers to them. As all of the objects under consideration could be coded as finite sequences of symbols, it would suffice to encode these sequences of symbols.

First, natural numbers are assigned to symbols. Function symbols for all polynomial-time functions are encoded by using trees of the primitive functions $\epsilon^n, \mathrm{proj}_i^n, s_0, s_1, \epsilon$ and labels that show how the function is derived by using Cobham's inductive definition of polynomial-time functions. Thus, the symbols that are used in our systems are finite, which enables the use of numbers $0, \dots, N$ to code these symbols. Then, the sequence of symbols is coded as $N+1$-adic numbers. The notation $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is used to represent the Gödel number of any symbol or sequence; for example, the Gödel number of the term $t(x)$ is denoted by $\lceil t(x) \rceil$.

For each object a consisting of symbols, $||a||$ denotes the number of primitive symbols in a and if a is a sequence or tree, $|||a|||$ denotes the number of nodes in a.

§3. PV and PV$^-$. In this section, we introduce our version of PV and PV$^-$.

PV is formulated as a theory of binary digits, rather than integers. Thus, the axiom $s_0 0 = 0$ does not exist. It is easy to see that our theory is able to encode the original PV. PV provides the symbols for the empty sequence ϵ and its binary successors s_0, s_1. If a term is solely constructed by ϵ, s_0, s_1, it is referred to as a *numeral*. Binary successors are functions, but to write down them we employ special convention to omit parenthesis after the function symbol. Thus, we write $s_0 s_1 x$ instead of $s_0(s_1(x))$.

The language of PV contains function symbols for all polynomial-time functions. In particular, it contains ϵ, s_0, s_1 and $|\cdot|, \lfloor \frac{\cdot}{2} \rfloor, \boxplus, \#, \epsilon^n, \mathrm{proj}_n^i$. The intuitive meaning is that $|n|$ is the length of bits of n, $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ is the division by two, $a \boxplus b = 2^{|a|+|b|}$, $a \# b = 2^{|a| \cdot |b|}$, ϵ^n is the n-ary constant function of which value is ϵ, and the projection proj_n^k. From here, a function symbol for a polynomial-time function f and f itself are often identified. Terms are denoted by $t, t_1, \dots, u, r, \dots$

For each function symbol f of a polynomial-time function, let $\mathrm{Base}(f)$ be the set of function symbols that are used in Cobham's recursive definition of f. For a set of function symbols S, we define $\mathrm{Base}(S) = \bigcup_{f \in S} \mathrm{Base}(f)$. If α represents any sequence of symbols, $\mathrm{Base}(\alpha)$ is defined by the union of $\mathrm{Base}(f)$ for the function symbols f that appear in α. $\mathrm{Base}(f)$ is computable by a polynomial-time function. For each function symbol f, $\mathrm{ar}(f)$ is the arity of f, assuming that $\mathrm{ar}(f) \leq ||f||$.

The only predicate which PV has the equality $=$. Formulas of PV are equality of two terms $t_1 = t_2$. Because PV which we consider is purely equational, formulas do not contain propositional connectives and quantifiers.

There are three kinds of axioms in PV, defining axioms, equality axioms and induction.

3.1. Defining axioms. For all Cobham's defining equations of polynomial-time functions, there are corresponding defining axioms in PV. For the constant function ϵ^n, the defining axiom is

$$\epsilon^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \epsilon \tag{2}$$

for a positive integer n. For the projection function, the defining axiom is

$$\mathrm{proj}_n^i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i \tag{3}$$

for a positive integer n and an integer $i, 1 \leq i \leq n$. For the binary successor functions s_0 and s_1, there is no defining axiom. If the function $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is defined by composition $g(h_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_m(x_1, \dots, x_n))$, the defining axiom is

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g(h_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_m(x_1, \dots, x_n)). \tag{4}$$

For the function which is defined by limited recursion on notation, there are three defining axioms

$$f(\epsilon, x_1, \cdots, x_n) = g_\epsilon(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \tag{5}$$

$$f(s_0 x, x_1, \cdots, x_n) = g_0(x, f(x, \overline{x}), x_1, \cdots, x_n) \tag{6}$$

$$f(s_1 x, x_1, \cdots, x_n) = g_1(x, f(x, \overline{x}), x_1, \cdots, x_n). \tag{7}$$

Even though Cook and Urquhart's PV [5] requires that all recursion schema is bounded by a function with polynomial-growth rate, we do not impose this restriction. Thus, our theory can be extended beyond polynomial-time functions. However, this paper focuses a theory based on polynomial-time functions.

3.2. Equality axioms. The identity axiom is formulated as

$$t = t \tag{8}$$

The rest of equality axioms are formulated as inference rules, rather than axioms.

$$\frac{u = t}{t = u} \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{t = u \quad u = r}{t = r} \tag{10}$$

$$\frac{t_1 = u_1 \quad \cdots \quad t_n = u_n}{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(u_1, \dots, u_n)} \tag{11}$$

$$\frac{t(x) = u(x)}{t(r) = u(r)} \tag{12}$$

3.3. Induction.

$$\frac{t_1(\epsilon) = t_2(\epsilon) \quad t_1(s_i x) = v_i(t_1(x)) \quad t_2(s_i x) = v_i(t_2(x)) \quad (i = 0, 1)}{t_1(x) = t_2(x)} \tag{13}$$

PV is the system which have defining axioms, equality axioms and induction as axioms and inference rules. PV^- is the system which have only defining axioms and equality axioms as axioms and inference rules. This paper prove that consistency of PV^- can be proven by S_2^2.

§4. Approximate computation. In this section, we define the notion of *approximate computations* as being representation of the evaluations of the terms of PV.

DEFINITION 1 (Approximate term). *Let* $\mathrm{PV}(*)$ *is the set of terms which is built from function symbols, variables and constants of* PV *plus a new constant* $*$. *We call elements of* $\mathrm{PV}(*)$ (approximate) terms. *If* $t \in \mathrm{PV}(*)$ *consists of* $s_0, s_1, \epsilon, *$, t *is called a* generalized numeral, *or in short a* g-numeral. *G-numerals are denoted by* $v, w, z, \ldots$.

DEFINITION 2 (Approximation relation). *Approximation relation* $\trianglelefteq$ *between elements of* $\mathrm{PV}(*)$ *is defined recursively as follows.*

- $r \trianglelefteq *$ *for any* $r \in \mathrm{PV}(*)$.
- *If* f *is a function symbol of* PV *and* $r_i \trianglelefteq t_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{ar}(f)$, *then* $f\overline{r} \trianglelefteq f\overline{t}$.

If $r \trianglelefteq t$ *and* $r \not\equiv t$ *holds, we write* $r \triangleleft t$. *If* $s \trianglelefteq t$, t *is called an approximation of* s.

DEFINITION 3. *Let* t *be a term of* $\mathrm{PV}(*)$. *A* development ρ *of* t *is a sequence of substitutions* $[t_1/x_1]\cdots[t_n/x_n]$ *such that* $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ *are all different and* $x_i \notin \mathrm{FV}(t_i)$. *Here,* $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ *can be open.*

Let v *be a g-numeral,* t *be a term, and* ρ *be a development of* t. *The form* $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ *is referred to as a* (computation) statement, t *as the main term,* ρ *as the environment, and* v *as the value (of* t*). Because we allow approximate computations, a term* t *may have several g-numerals as values under the same environment.*

A computation statement can be derived using the following rules, in which $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ for any function symbol f means that $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ really appears in $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$.

$$\frac{\langle t, \rho_2\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle x, \rho_1[t/x]\rho_2\rangle \downarrow v}\ \mathrm{Subst} \tag{14}$$

where ρ_1 does not contain a substitution to x.

$$\frac{}{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow *}\ * \tag{15}$$

for any $\mathrm{PV}(*)$-term t.

$$\frac{\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon}{\langle \epsilon, \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon}\ \epsilon \tag{16}$$

where $\rho \neq ()$.

$$\frac{}{\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon}\ \epsilon n \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{\langle s_i v^*, ()\rangle \downarrow s_i v^* \quad \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v^*}\ s_i \tag{18}$$

where i is either 0 or 1, v^* is an approximation of v and $t \not\equiv v^*$ or $\rho \neq ()$.

$$\frac{\langle v, ()\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle s_i v, ()\rangle \downarrow s_i v}\ s_i n \tag{19}$$

where i is either 0 or 1 and v is a g-numeral.

$$\frac{\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle \epsilon^m(t_1, \ldots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon}\ \epsilon^m \tag{20}$$

where ϵ^m is the n-ary constant function of which the value is always ϵ, and $X = \{i = 1, \ldots, m \mid t_i \text{ is not a g-numeral}\}$. $(\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}$ is the sequence $\langle t_{i_1}, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_{i_1}, \ldots, \langle t_{i_k}, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_{i_k}$ of statements where $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ is the sequence of the elements of X in the increasing order. We use similar notations from here.

$$\frac{\langle v_i^*, ()\rangle \downarrow v_i^* \quad (\langle t_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle \mathrm{proj}_m^i(t_1, \ldots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i^*}\ \mathrm{proj}_m^i \tag{21}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, m$. X is the set of all $j, 1 \leq j \leq m$ such that t_j is not a g-numeral. v_i^* is an approximation of v_i if $i \in X$ and v_i^* is an approximation of t_i if otherwise.

If f is defined by composition, we have the following rule.

(22)

$$\frac{\langle g(\overline{w^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow z \quad \langle h^1(\overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \cdots \langle h^m(\overline{v^m}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_m \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow z}\ \mathrm{comp}$$

where X is the set of $i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ such that t_i is not a g-numeral. $\overline{v^j} \equiv v_1^j, \ldots, v_n^j, j = 1, \ldots, m$ are approximate values of $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, where if $i \notin X$ we let v_i be t_i. $\overline{w^*}$ are approximate values of $w_1, \ldots, w_m$.

If f is defined by recursion, we have the following rule.

$$\frac{\langle g_\epsilon(\overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow z \quad \{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon\} \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t, t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow z}\ \text{rec-}\epsilon \tag{23}$$

(24)

$$\frac{\langle g_i(v_0^1, w^1, \overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow z \quad \{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v_0\} \quad \langle f(v_0^2, \overline{v^2}), ()\rangle \downarrow w \quad (\langle t_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(t, t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow z}\ \text{rec-}s_i$$

where $i = 0, 1$ and X is the set of $j, 1 \leq j \leq n$ such that t_j is not a g-numeral. The clauses $\{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon\}$, $\{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v_0\}$ exist if t is not a g-numeral. $\overline{v^1} \equiv v_1^1, \ldots, v_n^1, \overline{v^2} \equiv v_1^2, \ldots, v_n^2$ are approximate values of $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, where $v_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ is t_j if $j \notin X$. v_0^1, v_0^2 and w^1 are approximations of v_0 and w respectively.

We can observe that all rules except substitution (Subst-)rule and $*$-rule have a common form as

$$\frac{\beta \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow w} \tag{25}$$

where X is the set of $i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ such that t_i is not a g-numeral, main terms of β are either g-numerals or function applications to g-numerals and environments of β are $()$. In particular if X is empty, the inference is called *purely numerical*. By removing $(\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}$ from the assumptions and changing t_i to v_i, we

either obtain an inference of a purely numerical form or make the assumption and conclusion identical. Thus the inference becomes

$$\frac{\beta}{\langle f(v_1,\dots,v_n),\rho\rangle \downarrow w} \tag{26}$$

where $v_i \equiv t_i$ if $i \notin X$ and the double line indicates either 1- or 0-step of an inference. Conversely, assume that an inference R is purely numerical.

$$\frac{\beta}{\langle f(v_1,\dots,v_n),\rho\rangle \downarrow w} \tag{27}$$

Let $t_1,\dots,t_n$ be a sequence of terms such that for each t_i, if t_i is a g-numeral then $t_i \equiv v_i$. Then,

$$\frac{\beta \quad (\langle t_i,\rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1,\dots,t_n),\rho\rangle \downarrow w} \tag{28}$$

where if t_i is not a g-numeral, $i \in X$, is a valid R-rule.

If the inference R is composition, recursion or successor (comp, rec-ϵ or s_i)-rules, R have the form

(29)

$$\frac{\langle f_1(\overline{v^1}),()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \quad (\langle f_i(\overline{v^i},w_1^i,\dots,w_{i-1}^i),()\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i=2,\dots,m} \quad (\langle t_j,\rho\rangle \downarrow v_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(t_1,\dots,t_n),\rho\rangle \downarrow z}$$

where X is the set of indices j such that t_j is not a g-numeral. $\overline{v^i}, i = 1,\dots,m$ are all approximations of $\overline{v}$, where $v_j, j = 1,\dots,n$ is t_j if t_j is a g-numeral and v_j otherwise. $w_l^k, k = 2,\dots,m, l = 1,\dots,m-1$ is an approximation of w_l. v_l^k and w_l^k may not actually appear in $f_i(\overline{v^i},w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})$.

Definition 4 (Computation Sequence). *A* computation sequence σ *is a sequence* $\sigma_1,\dots\sigma_L$ *where each* σ_i *has a form*

$$\langle\langle n_{1i},\dots,n_{l_i i}\rangle,\langle t_i,\rho_i\rangle \downarrow v_i\rangle \tag{30}$$

and each inference

$$\frac{\pi_2(\sigma_{n_{1i}}) \quad \cdots \quad \pi_2(\sigma_{n_{l_i i}})}{\pi_2(\sigma_i)} \tag{31}$$

is a valid computation rule. Here, π_2 *is a projection of* $\langle x,y\rangle$ *to* y*. Those computation statements that are not used as assumptions of some inference rule, are referred to as* conclusions *of* σ*. If* $\langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v$ *is the only conclusion of* σ*, it is written as* $\sigma \vdash \langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v$*; however, if* σ *has multiple conclusions* $\overline{\alpha}$*, it is written as* $\sigma \vdash \overline{\alpha}$*. If* $\sigma \vdash \langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$*,* σ *is often considered to be a computation of* $\langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v$*. If there is a computation* $\sigma,\sigma \vdash \langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$ *such that its length is shorter than* B*, it is written as* $\vdash_B \langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$*.*

Although a computation sequence σ *is a sequence,* σ *is often considered to be a DAG, of which the conclusions form the lowest elements.*

The basic properties of the inference rules are observed. (S_2^1) means that the statement is provable in the theory S_2^1 and (S_2^2) means that the statement is provable in the S_2^2.

LEMMA 1 (S^1_2). *If $\langle \epsilon, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ is contained in a computation σ, then either $v \equiv \epsilon$ or $v \equiv *$. If $\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ is contained in σ, then either $v \equiv s_i v_0$ for some g-numeral v_0 or $v \equiv *$. If $v \equiv s_i v_0$, then σ contains $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v'_0$ and $v'_0 \trianglelefteq v_0$.*

PROOF. By induction on $|||\sigma|||$. Assume that the lemma holds for $|||\sigma||| \leq L$. Let $|||\sigma||| = L + 1$. The only rule which can derive $\langle \epsilon, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ is either ϵ, ϵn or $*$-rule. By induction hypothesis, v is either ϵ or $*$. Similarly, if σ derives $\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ and $t \not\equiv v$ or $\rho \not\equiv ()$, the only rule which can derive this is $*$, s_i. If $v \equiv s_i v_0$, $\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v_0$ can only be derived by s_i. Thus, the assumptions contain $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v'_0$ where $v'_0 \trianglelefteq v_0$. If $t \equiv v_0$ and $\rho = ()$, the only rule which can derive this is $*$ or $s_i n$. Thus, if $v \equiv s_i v_0$, σ contains $\langle v_0, ()\rangle \downarrow v_0$. ⊣

LEMMA 2 (S^1_2). *If $\langle v, \rho\rangle \downarrow w$ in which v and w are g-numerals, is contained in a computation σ, $v \trianglelefteq w$.*

PROOF. By induction on the length of v. If $v \equiv *$, there is no rule other than $*$-rule which derives $\langle v, \rho\rangle \downarrow w$. Thus $w \equiv *$. If $v \equiv \epsilon$, by Lemma 1 $v \trianglelefteq w$. If $v \equiv s_i v_0$, by Lemma 1, either $w \equiv *$ or $w \equiv s_0 w_0$ such that σ contains $\langle v_0, \rho\rangle \downarrow w'_0$ where $w'_0 \trianglelefteq w_0$. By induction hypotheses, $v_0 \trianglelefteq w'_0$. Thus $v \trianglelefteq w$. ⊣

LEMMA 3 (S^1_2). *If $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ is contained in σ, then $\langle v, ()\rangle \downarrow v$ is also contained in σ.*

PROOF. By induction on $|||\sigma|||$ and the case analysis on the inference R which derives $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$.

For the case of Subst-rule, the lemma is derived from induction hypothesis.

For the cases of $*$, ϵ, ϵn, s_i, $s_i n$, ϵ^m, proj^j_m, the lemma is immediate from the from of inferences.

For the cases of comp, rec-ϵ, rec-s_i, the lemma is derived from induction hypothesis. ⊣

LEMMA 4 (S^1_2). *If σ contains $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$, we can obtain a new computation τ which derives $\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v$ by adding at most two inferences.*

PROOF. If $t \equiv v$ and $\rho = ()$, the lemma clearly holds. Assume $t \not\equiv v$. By Lemma 3, $\langle v, ()\rangle \downarrow v$ is contained in σ. Then, the computation

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\langle v, ()\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle s_i v, ()\rangle \downarrow s_i v} \quad \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v} \tag{32}$$

can be obtained by adding two inferences. The lemma is proved. ⊣

LEMMA 5 (S^1_2). *If $\sigma \vdash \alpha, \overline{\alpha}$, then there exists τ such that $\tau \vdash \overline{\alpha}$ and $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma|||$.*

LEMMA 6 (S^1_2). *Let σ be a computation of which the conclusions are $\langle t_1, \rho_1\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_m, \rho_m\rangle \downarrow v_m$. Then, every development ρ which appears in σ, is a subsequence of one of the $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_m$.*

LEMMA 7 (S^1_2). *If σ contains $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$, then $||v|| \leq 3 \cdot |||\sigma|||$.*

PROOF. The number of successor functions in v is increased by one, only according to the $s_i n$-rule (19). ⊣

Now, we want to bound the size of the Gödel number of the computation sequence σ by using its number of nodes $|||\sigma|||$ and the sizes of its conclusions. For this, two lemmas are required.

LEMMA 8 (S_2^1). *Assume that a computation $\sigma \equiv \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_L$ contains $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ and t contains a proper subterm u such that u is a g-numeral. u is a* proper *subterm of t if u is a subterm of t and $u \not\equiv t$. Let $\langle t_1, \rho_1\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_m, \rho_m\rangle \downarrow v_m$ be conclusions of σ. Then,*

$$||u|| \leq \max\{3 \cdot |||\sigma|||, T(\sigma)\} \tag{33}$$

where $T(\sigma) = \max\{||t_1||, \ldots, ||t_m||, ||\rho_1||, \ldots, ||\rho_m||\}$

PROOF. Assume $\pi_2(\sigma_i) \equiv \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$. We prove the lemma by induction on $|||\sigma||| - i$.

If σ_i is a conclusion of σ, the lemma is trivial.

Assuming the lemma is valid for σ_i, it is proven that all the assumptions of σ_i are able to satisfy the lemma by performing a case analysis of the inference R, which derives σ_i.

First, the case for which R represents the substitution rule is considered.

$$\frac{\langle t, \rho_2\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle x, \rho_1[t/x]\rho_2\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{34}$$

If t contains a proper subterm u that is a g-numeral, then $||u|| < ||t||$ and, according to lemma 6, $||t|| \leq T$, in which case the lemma has been proven.

The proof of the case for the $*$, ϵ, ϵn, $s_i n$, ϵ^m and proj_m^j-rules is trivial.

we next consider the composition, recursion and s_i-rules, which can be written in the following form by observation (29).

(35)
$$\frac{\langle f_1(\overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \quad (\langle f_i(\overline{v^i}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i), ()\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i=2,\ldots,m} \quad (\langle t_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow z}$$

Let t_j be one of $\{t_j \mid j \in X\}$, which contains a proper subterm u such that u is a g-numeral. Since u is a proper subterm of t_j, according to the induction hypothesis, the lemma is proven.

Assuming that u is contained in $f_i(\overline{v^i}, \overline{w^i})$, then, u is a g-numeral that either is an approximation of $\overline{t}$ or $\overline{v^0}$ or $\overline{w}$. For the case of $\overline{t}$, the induction hypothesis is applied, whereby the lemma is proven. Other g-numerals can be bounded by $3 \cdot |||\sigma|||$ according to Lemma 7. ⊣

LEMMA 9. *Let $\sigma \vdash \langle t_1, \rho_1\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_m, \rho_m\rangle \downarrow v_m$ is a computation. Then, all function symbols that appear in σ are contained in* $\mathrm{Base}(t_1, \ldots, t_m, \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_m)$. *In particular, $||f|| \leq T(\sigma)$.*

PROOF. Let $\sigma = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_L$ and $\pi_2(\sigma_k) \equiv \langle u_k, \delta_k\rangle \downarrow w_k$. If $\langle u_k, \delta_k\rangle \downarrow w_k$ is a conclusion, the lemma holds. Assuming that $\langle u_k, \delta_k\rangle \downarrow w_k$ satisfies the lemma, we prove that each assumption satisfies the lemma. However, this is trivial by the forms of the inference rules. ⊣

LEMMA 10 (S_2^1). *Let $M(\sigma_i)$ be the size of the main term of σ_i, and $M(\sigma)$ be the maximal size of the main terms that appear in a computation $\sigma = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$. Then we have*

$$M(\sigma) \leq C \cdot (T(\sigma) + |||\sigma||| + 1)^2 \tag{36}$$

where $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ are the main terms of the conclusions of σ, $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_m$ are environments of conclusions of σ, and C is a sufficiently large constant of which the value remains fixed throughout this paper.

PROOF. Here it is proven that $M(\sigma_i)$ satisfies the lemma according to the induction on $n - i$.

The case for which σ_i is a conclusion is immediate, because $M(\sigma_i) \leq T$.

Assuming that σ_i satisfies the induction hypothesis, it is proven that all assumptions that derive σ_i, satisfy the lemma. A case analysis of the inference R that derives σ_i is performed. First, we consider the substitution rules.

$$\frac{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle x, \rho'[t/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{37}$$

It follows from Lemma 6 that $||t|| \leq T$, which proves that the lemma is satisfied.

Next, we consider the other rules. Because the proof for $*$-, the successor (s_i, $s_i n$-), constant (ϵ-) and projection (proj$_m^j$-) rule are trivial, it is assumed that R is either the composition rule or one of recursion rules. These rules can be written in the following form.

(38)
$$\frac{\langle f_1(\overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \quad (\langle f_i(\overline{v^i}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i), ()\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i=2,\ldots,m} \quad (\langle t_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow z}$$

where $t_j, j \in X$ are the terms in $\overline{t}$ which are not g-numerals. The elements of $\overline{v^1}, \ldots, \overline{v^m}$ are g-numerals which are approximations of either $\overline{v}$ or $\overline{t}$. Further, $\overline{w^i}, i = 2, \ldots, m$ are approximations of $w_1, \ldots, w_m$.

As $||t_j|| \leq ||f(\overline{t})||$ for $j \in X$ and the induction hypothesis is valid, the lemma holds for these assumptions.

Let $f_i(\overline{v^i}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i)$ be one of $f_i(\overline{v^i})$ or $f_i(\overline{v^i}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i), i = 2, \ldots, m$. As the elements of $\overline{v^i}$ are either approximations of $\overline{v}$ or $\overline{t}$, each of their sizes are bounded by $\max\{3 \cdot |||\sigma|||, T\}$ according to Lemma 8. Also $||f_i|| \leq T(\sigma)$ by Lemma 9, thus

$$||f_i(\overline{v^1}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i)|| \leq ||f_i|| + \mathrm{ar}(f_i) \cdot (C + \max\{3 \cdot |||\sigma|||, T\}) \tag{39}$$
$$\leq T + T \cdot (C + \max\{3 \cdot |||\sigma|||, T\}) \tag{40}$$
$$\leq T + T \cdot (C + 3 \cdot |||\sigma||| + T) \tag{41}$$
$$= T \cdot (C + 3 \cdot |||\sigma||| + T + 1) \tag{42}$$
$$\leq C \cdot T \cdot (1 + |||\sigma||| + T) \tag{43}$$
$$\leq C \cdot (1 + |||\sigma||| + T)^2. \tag{44}$$

This proves the validity of the lemma. ⊣

LEMMA 11. *(S^1_2) There is a polynomial p such that if $\vdash_B \langle \overline{t}, \overline{\rho}\rangle \downarrow \overline{v}$ then there is a computation sequence σ that satisfies $|\lceil\sigma\rceil| \leq p(|\lceil\overline{t}\rceil|, |\lceil\overline{\rho}\rceil|, B)$.*

PROOF. For each occurrence $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$, the sizes of t and v are bounded by $M(\sigma)$ and $3B$, respectively. Because ρ, which appears in each computation statement in σ is a subsequence of one of $\overline{\rho}$, the lemma has been proven. ⊣

LEMMA 12. *(S^1_2) $\vdash_B \langle t_1, \rho_1\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_m, \rho_m\rangle \downarrow v_m$ can be written by using a Σ^b_1-formula.*

PROOF. Immediate from Lemma 11. ⊣

CLAIM 1. *(S^1_2) If $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ appears as a node in the computation sequence $\sigma, \sigma \vdash \overline{\alpha}$ (as a DAG), there is a computation sequence τ such that $\tau \vdash \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$, $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + 1$ and $M(\tau) = M(\sigma)$.*

PROOF. If $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ is derived according to the inference R, another instance of R is added to σ, which uses the same assumptions as R, in which case τ is obtained. ⊣

LEMMA 13 (S^2_2). *(Substitution Lemma I) Let U, V be a large integer. Let σ be a computation of which the conclusions are $\langle t_1[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_m[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_m, \overline{\alpha}$ where ρ is a development and $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ are targets of transformation that contain x as a free variable, while $\overline{\alpha}$ are not modified. Here, it can be assumed that x is fresh, that is, it is not used in σ. Further, we assume that $|||\sigma||| \leq U - ||t_1[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_m[u/x]||$ and $M(\sigma) \leq V$. Then, there is a computation τ that derives $\langle t_i, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_i, i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\overline{\alpha}$ such that $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]||$ and $M(\tau) \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||$. Further, τ derives α using the same premises and inference rules to σ.*

PROOF. The lemma is proven by induction on $||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]||$. Because $|||\sigma|||, |||\tau|||$, $M(\sigma), M(\tau)$ and all developments which appear in $|||\sigma|||$ and $|||\tau|||$ are bounded by a polynomial of U, V, $||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]||$, $||\rho||$ and $||\alpha||$, the proof can be carried out within S^2_2. The property that τ has the same inferences which derive α to σ, is immediate from the construction.

The base case is trivial because σ itself is used as τ. Thus, it is assumed that $m \geq 1$, following which the case analysis of the inference R is carried out, which derives $\langle t_1[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$ of σ. Because the last statement of σ is always a conclusion, by rearranging the index, it can be assumed that $\langle t_1[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$ is the last statement of σ.

First, we consider the case that R is the substitution rule. Assume that ρ has a form $\rho^1[s/y]\rho^2$.

$$\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \sigma_1\\ \langle s, \rho^2\rangle \downarrow v\end{array}}{\langle y, \rho^1[s/y]\rho^2\rangle \downarrow v}\ R \tag{45}$$

We have $y \equiv t_1[u/x]$. There are two possible ways in which y and $t_1[u/x]$ can be related to each other:

1. $t_1 \equiv x$ and $u \equiv y$.
2. $t_1 \equiv y$.

However, as it is assumed that t_1 contains x as a free variable, 2. is impossible. Thus, we only consider the first possibility 1.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \sigma_1\\ \langle s, \rho^2\rangle \downarrow v_1\end{array}}{\langle x[y/x], \rho^1[s/y]\rho^2\rangle \downarrow v_1}\ R \tag{46}$$

We transform all substitutions $t_2[u/x], \cdots, t_m[u/x]$ except $t_1[u/x]$ in σ and obtain τ_1 using induction hypothesis. Induction hypothesis can be applied because $|||\sigma||| \leq U - ||t_1[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_m[u/x]|| \leq U - ||t_2[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_m[u/x]||$ and $M(\sigma)$ is bounded by V. τ_1 derives $\langle t_2, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_2, \ldots, \langle t_m, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_m, \langle y, \rho^1[s/y]\rho^2\rangle \downarrow v_1, \overline{\alpha}$.

Then, we add this inference to τ_1 and obtain τ.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \tau_1\\ \langle y, \rho^1[s/y]\rho^2\rangle \downarrow v_1\end{array}}{\langle x, [y/x]\rho^1[s/y]\rho^2\rangle \downarrow v_1.} \tag{47}$$

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| + 1 \tag{48}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_2[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]|| + 1 \tag{49}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]|| \tag{50}$$

Because $M(\tau) = \max\{||x||, M(\tau_1)\} \leq \max\{||x||, M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||\} \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||$, τ satisfies the conclusion of the induction hypothesis.

Next, we consider the case that R has the form

$$\overline{\langle t_1[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow *} \tag{51}$$

For this case, τ can be defined trivially.

$$\overline{\langle t_1, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow *} \tag{52}$$

Next, we consider the case that R is not the substitution rule nor $*$-rule by considering two cases, namely that that $t_1[u/x] \equiv f(r_1[u/x], \ldots, r_k[u/x])$ and $t_1[u/x] \equiv u$.

First, we consider the former of the two cases. R has the form

$$\frac{\beta \quad (\langle r_i[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(r_1[u/x], \ldots, r_m[u/x]), \rho\rangle \downarrow z} \tag{53}$$

where $\overline{\beta}$ are assumptions of which the main terms do not contain substitution $[u/x]$, and $r_i, i \in X$ is a term among $\overline{r}$ such that $r_i[u/x]$ is not a g-numerals. Let σ_1 be a computation which is obtained from σ by removing R. By Claim 1, we construct σ_0 from σ_1 such that σ_0 has additional conclusions $\langle r_i[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow w_i$ for all $i \in X$ and $\overline{\beta}$ to σ_1. To estimate $|||\sigma_0|||$, first we calculate $||t_1[u/x]||$. $||t_1[u/x]|| = ||f|| + ||r_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||r_m[u/x]|| + m + 1$ where $m+1$ is the number of parenthesizes and commas. Because $\#\beta \leq ||f||$, $||t_1[u/x]||$ is estimated using terms of $\#\beta$ and $||r_i[u/x]||$ for all $i \in X$ by $||t_1[u/x]|| \geq \#\beta + \sum_{i\in X} ||r_i[u/x]|| +$

$\#X$. Thus

$$|||\sigma_0||| \leq |||\sigma_1||| + \#X + \#\overline{\beta} \tag{54}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| - 1 + \#X + \#\overline{\beta} \tag{55}$$

$$\leq U - ||t_1[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_n[u/x]|| - 1 + \#X + \#\overline{\beta} \tag{56}$$

$$\leq U - \sum_{i \in X} ||r_i[u/x]|| - ||t_2[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_n[u/x]|| - 1 \tag{57}$$

As $M(\sigma_0) \leq M(\sigma_1) \leq M(\sigma)$, it becomes possible to apply the induction hypothesis to σ_0 to obtain

$$\tau_0 \vdash (\langle r_i, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i \in X}, \langle t_2, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_2, \ldots, \langle t_n, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_n, \overline{\alpha}, \overline{\beta} \tag{58}$$

and $|||\tau_0||| \leq |||\sigma_0||| + \sum_{i \in X} ||r_i[u/x]|| + ||t_2[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_n[u/x]||$.

Let $r_j[u/x], j \in Y$ be a g-numeral among $r_i[u/x], i = 1, \ldots, k$. If Y is not empty, u is a g-muneral. The computations τ_j of $\langle r_j, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow r_j[u/x]$ can be constructed from the computation of $\langle x, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow u$ by repeatedly applying Lemma 4. The computation of $\langle x, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow u$ can be derived from the computation τ^u of $\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow u$ by the substitution rule. Let l_u be the number of successor functions which appear in u and l_j be the number of successor functions which appear in r_j. Further, let l be $l_u + l_j$. Then, $||r_j[u/x]|| = 3l + 1$ because for each function application $r_j[u/x]$ has a function symbol and two parenthesizes. On the other hand, according to Lemma 4, $\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow u$ can be derived from $\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon$ by $2l_u + 1$ inferences. Thus $|||\tau^u||| = 2l_u + 2$. Combining the result of Lemma 4, $|||\tau_j^0||| \leq 2l_j + 2l_u + 3 = 2(l + 1) + 1$. Thus, $|||\tau_j||| \leq ||r_j[u/x]|| + 2$. Because the node $\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon$ can be shared, to derive $\langle r_j, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow r_j[u/x]$ for $j \in Y$, we only need the total nodes $\sum_{j \in Y} |||\tau_j||| - \#Y + 1 = \sum_{j \in Y} ||r_j[u/x]|| + \#Y + 1$.

For all $j \in Y$, τ_j are added to τ_0 and inference rule R is applied, following which $\tau \vdash \langle t_1, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_n, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_n, \overline{\alpha}$ is obtained. Then, $|||\tau|||$ is bounded by

$$|||\tau_0||| + 1 + \sum_{j \in Y} |||\tau_j||| \tag{59}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma_0||| + 1 + \sum_{j \in Y} |||\tau_j||| + \sum_{i \in X} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} ||t_k[u/x]|| \tag{60}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma_0||| + 2 + \#Y + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} ||t_k[u/x]|| \tag{61}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma_1||| + \#X + \#\beta + 2 + \#Y + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} ||t_k[u/x]|| \tag{62}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + \#X + \#\beta + 1 + \#Y + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} ||t_k[u/x]|| \tag{63}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + \#\beta + m + 1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} ||t_k[u/x]|| \tag{64}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n} ||t_k[u/x]|| \tag{65}$$

because $\#\beta \leq ||f||$. Further, because $M(\tau_0) \leq M(\sigma_0) \cdot ||x|| \leq M(\sigma_1) \cdot ||x|| \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||$ and $M(\tau) \leq \max\{||t_1||, M(\tau_0)\} \leq \max\{||t_1||, M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||\} \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||$, which means that the case is valid.

Next, we consider the later of the two cases for which $t_1[u/x] \equiv u$. Let τ_1 be the computation which obtained by transforming $\langle t_k[u/x], \rho_k\rangle \downarrow v_k, k = 2, \ldots, n$ to $\langle t_k, [u/x]\rho_k\rangle \downarrow v_k, k = 2, \ldots, n$ using induction hypothesis. Induction hypothesis can be applied because $|||\sigma||| \leq U - ||t_2[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_m[u/x]$ and $M(\sigma) \leq V$.

The computation τ is defined by adding the following inference to τ_1.

$$\frac{\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v}{\langle x, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{66}$$

Because $||t_1[u/x]|| \geq 1$, we have

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| + 1 \tag{67}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_2[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]|| + 1 \tag{68}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]|| \tag{69}$$

and $M(\tau) \leq \max\{||x||, M(\tau_1)\} \leq \max\{||x||, M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||\} \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||x||$. Therefore, the case is valid. ⊣

LEMMA 14 (S_2^2). *(Substitution Lemma II) Let U, V be large integers. Let σ be a computation of which the conclusions are $\langle t_1, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \ldots, \langle t_n, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_n, \overline{\alpha}$. Assuming that $|||\sigma||| \leq U - ||t_1[u/x]|| - \cdots - ||t_n[u/x]||$ and $M(\sigma) \leq V$, there is a τ which derives $\langle t_i[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\overline{\alpha}$ such that $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_n[u/x]||$ and $M(\tau) \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||u||$. Further, τ derives $\overline{\alpha}$ using the same premises and inference rules in α .*

PROOF. The lemma is proven by showing induction on $||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_n[u/x]||$ and sub-induction on $|||\sigma|||$. Because σ and τ are bounded, the proof can be carried out inside S_2^2. The property that τ has the same inferences and premises which derive α to σ, is immediate from the construction.

The cases are distinguished according to the form of the last inference R of σ. It can be assumed that t_1 is the main term of the last statement of σ.

First, the case for which R is the substitution rule is presented.

$$\frac{\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1}{\langle x, [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v_1} \tag{70}$$

Because t_1 contains x as a free variable, $t_1 \equiv x$. We remove R and specify $\langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$ as a conclusion. Let τ be the computation that is obtained in this way. Then, $|||\tau||| \leq ||\sigma|| - 1 + 1 \leq U - ||t_1|| - \cdots - ||t_m|| \leq U - ||t_2|| - \cdots - ||t_m||$. Because $M(\tau) \leq M(\sigma)$, according to the induction hypothesis, the case is valid.

Next, the remaining cases, for which $t_1(x) \equiv f(r_1(x), \ldots, r_m(x))$ and R has the following form, are presented. Because the case of $*$-rule is trivial, the proof for this case is omitted. Then R has a form

$$\frac{\overline{\beta} \quad (\langle r_i(x), [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(r_1(x), \ldots, r_m(x)), [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v}\ R \tag{71}$$

where the main terms of $\overline{\beta}$ do not contain x as a free variable, and $r_i(x), i \in X$ are terms that are not g-numerals among $\overline{r}$. According to Claim 1, it is possible to construct σ_1 that contains $\overline{\beta}, (\langle r_i(x), [u/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i\in X}$ as conclusions. $|||\sigma_1|||$

can be bounded by

$$(72) |||\sigma||| + \#X + \#\overline{\beta}$$

$$(73) \leq U - \sum_{1\leq j\leq n} ||t_j[u/x]|| + \#X + \#\overline{\beta}$$

$$(74) \leq U - (\#\beta + m + \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} ||u_i[u/x]||) - \sum_{2\leq j\leq n} ||t_j[u/x]|| + \#X + \#\overline{\beta}$$

$$(75) \leq U - \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} ||u_i[u/x]|| - \sum_{2\leq j\leq n} ||t_j[u/x]||$$

and $M(\sigma_1) \leq M(\sigma)$. Thus, it becomes possible to apply the induction hypothesis to σ_1. Then, we have τ_1 that has $(\langle r_i[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i\in X}, \overline{\beta}, \langle t_2[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_2, \ldots, \langle t_n[u/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v_n, \overline{\alpha}$ as conclusions, to which R is applied to obtain τ.

$$\frac{\overline{\beta} \quad (\langle r_i(u), \rho\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i\in Y}}{\langle f(r_1(u), \ldots, r_m(u)), \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1} \; R \tag{76}$$

where $Y \subseteq X$ is the set of indices i such that $r_i(u)$ is not a g-numeral. $M(\tau) \leq \max\{M(\tau_1), ||t_1(u)||\} \leq M(\sigma) \cdot ||u||$ and

$$(77) \quad |||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| + 1$$

$$(78) \qquad \leq |||\sigma_1||| + 1 + \sum_{i\in X} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2\leq j\leq n} ||t_j[u/x]||$$

$$(79) \qquad \leq |||\sigma||| + \#X + \#\overline{\beta} + 1 + \sum_{i\in X} ||r_i[u/x]|| + \sum_{2\leq j\leq n} ||t_j[u/x]||$$

$$(80) \qquad \leq |||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_n[u/x]||.$$

The lemma has been proven. ⊣

Lemma 15 (S^1_2). *Let $c(t)$ be ϵ or s_0t or s_1t or t. If*

$$f(c(t), \overline{u}) = t_{f,c}(t, f(t, \overline{u}), \overline{u}) \tag{81}$$

is the defining axiom of f and $\vdash_B \langle f(c(t), \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$, then we have

$$\vdash_{B+||f(c(t),\overline{t})=t_{f,c}(t,f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u})||} \langle t_{f,c}(t, f(t, \overline{u}), \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v', \overline{\alpha}. \tag{82}$$

such that $v' \trianglelefteq v$. Further, the construction does not change the premises and inferences which derive $\overline{\alpha}$.

Proving this lemma requires the definition of a technical claim.

Claim 2 (S^1_2). *Let f be an n-ary function symbol and $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ be a sequence of terms. Assume that $(t_i)_{i\in X}$ be the subsequence of $\overline{t}$ which are not g-numerals. Assume $\langle f(v^*_1, \ldots, v^*_n), ()\rangle \downarrow z$ and $\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i, i \in X$ appear in the computation σ where $v^*_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ is an approximation of v_i if t_i is not a g-numeral and an approximation of t_i if t_i is a g-numeral.*

Then there is a computation τ that has $\langle f(\overline{t}), \rho\rangle \downarrow z$ as a conclusion, contains all the computation statements and inferences of σ and satisfies $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma|||+1$.

PROOF. The claim is proven by using the case analysis of the inference R that derives $\langle f(\overline{v^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow z$. It is impossible for R to be the substitution rule, ϵ or ϵn, otherwise the main term of the conclusion of R would be a variable or a constant. If R is $*$-rule, the proof is trivial.

If R is $s_i n$-rule, R has the following form.

$$\frac{\langle v_1^*, ()\rangle \downarrow v_1^*}{\langle s_i v_1^*, ()\rangle \downarrow s_i v_1^*}\ s_i n \tag{83}$$

We transform this inference to

$$\frac{\dfrac{\langle v_1^*, ()\rangle \downarrow v_1^*}{\langle s_i v_1^*, ()\rangle \downarrow s_i v_1^*}\ s_i n \qquad \langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1}{\langle s_i t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i v_1^*.}\ s_i \tag{84}$$

The claim is proved.

Thus, R is assumed to have the following form.

$$\frac{\langle f_1(\overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \quad (\langle f_i(\overline{v^i}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i), ()\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i=2,\ldots,m}}{\langle f(v_1^*, \ldots, v_n^*), ()\rangle \downarrow z} \tag{85}$$

By assumption, we add the following inference and obtain τ.

(86)

$$\frac{\langle f_1(\overline{v^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \quad (\langle f_i(\overline{v^i}, w_1^i, \ldots, w_{i-1}^i), ()\rangle \downarrow w_i)_{i=2,\ldots,m} \quad (\langle t_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow z}$$

The claim has been proven. ⊣

PROOF OF LEMMA 15. Let σ be a computation sequence that derives $\vdash_B \langle f(c(t), \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$. The lemma is proven by conducting a case analysis of the inference rule R of $\langle f(c(t), \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ and the defining axioms of f. If R is $*$-rule, the proof is obvious. Thus, we assume that R is not $*$-rule. Then, the rule that is applied to R is determined by the defining axiom of f.

For the case that $f \equiv \epsilon$ or $f \equiv s_i$, the defining axioms do not exist. Thus, the lemma vacuously holds.

For the case in which $f \equiv \epsilon^n$, R has the form

$$\frac{\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle \epsilon^n(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon.} \tag{87}$$

Then,

$$\frac{\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon}{\langle \epsilon, \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon.} \tag{88}$$

if $\rho \not\equiv ()$, or else $\langle \epsilon, \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon$ can be directly derived. The case is valid.

For the case in which $f \equiv \mathrm{proj}_i^n$, R has the form

$$\frac{\langle v_i^*, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i^* \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle \mathrm{proj}_i^n(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i^*.} \tag{89}$$

If i is not included in X, then t_i is a g-numeral v_i and $v_i \trianglelefteq v_i^*$. $\langle v_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i^*$ can be derived at most $||v_i||$-steps of inferences. Thus, it proves the lemma. If i is included in X, because $v_i \trianglelefteq v_i^*$, the lemma is proved.

For the case in which f is defined by the composition $g(h_1(\overline{x}), \dots, h_n(\overline{x}))$, the inference R of σ that derives $\langle f(t_1, \dots, t_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow v$, has the following form.

(90)
$$\frac{\langle g(\overline{w^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow v \quad \langle h_1(\overline{z^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1 \quad \cdots \quad \langle h_m(\overline{z^m}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_m \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v}$$

Using Claim 2 repeatedly, $\tau_1 \vdash \langle g(\overline{w^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow v, \langle h_1(\overline{t}), \rho\rangle \downarrow w_1, \dots, \langle h_m(\overline{t}), \rho\rangle \downarrow w_m$ is obtained, in which $|||\tau_1||| \leq |||\sigma||| + \#\overline{h}$ and where $\#\overline{h}$ is the number of elements of the sequence $\overline{h}$. Again, using Claim 2, $\tau \vdash \langle g(\overline{h}(\overline{t})), \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$, is obtained.

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| + 1 \tag{91}$$
$$\leq |||\sigma||| + \#\overline{h} + 1 \tag{92}$$
$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||g(\overline{h}(\overline{t}))|| \tag{93}$$

The case is valid.

If f is defined by recursion, according to Lemma 1 the inference that derives $\langle f(t, u_1, \dots, u_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ has the form

$$\frac{\langle g_\epsilon(\overline{z^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow v \quad (\langle u_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(\epsilon, u_1, \dots, u_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{94}$$

or for each $i = 0, 1$,

(95)
$$\frac{\langle g_i(z_0^1, w^1, \overline{z^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow v \quad \langle f(z_0^2, \overline{z^2}), ()\rangle \downarrow w \quad \langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i z_0 \quad (\langle u_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(s_i t, \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v}$$

if t is not a g-numeral, or

$$\frac{\langle g_i(z_0^1, w^1, \overline{z^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow v \quad \langle f(z_0^2, \overline{z^2}), ()\rangle \downarrow w \quad (\langle u_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_j)_{j\in X}}{\langle f(s_i t, \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{96}$$

if t is a g-numeral and $t \equiv z_0$. First, consider the case of (94). According to Claim 2, and Lemma 5, we have τ that satisfies $\tau \vdash \langle g(u_1, \dots, u_n), \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$ and

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + 1 \tag{97}$$
$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||f(\epsilon, u_1, \dots, u_m)|| \tag{98}$$

Thus, the case has been shown to be valid.

Next, consider the case of (95). According to Lemma 1, $\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_0', z_0' \trianglelefteq z_0$ is contained in σ. According to Claim 2, we have τ_1 which has the conclusion $\langle f(t, \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow w$. Since τ_1 contains all the statements of σ, $\langle g_i(v_0^1, w^1, \overline{z^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow v$, and $\langle u_j, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_j, j \in X$ appear in τ_1. Using Claim 2 again, we obtain $\tau \vdash \langle g(t, f(t, \overline{u}), \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v$.

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| + 1 \tag{99}$$
$$\leq |||\sigma||| + 1 + 1 \tag{100}$$
$$\leq |||\sigma||| + 2 \tag{101}$$
$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||g_i(t, f(t, \overline{u}), \overline{u})|| \tag{102}$$

The case is valid.

Finally, the case of (96) is considered. According to Claim 2, there is a computation τ_1 that has $\langle f(t,\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow w$ as a conclusion. Since τ_1 contains all the statements of σ, $\langle g_i(v_0^1, w^1, \overline{z^1}),()\rangle \downarrow v$, and $\langle u_j,\rho\rangle \downarrow z_j, j \in X$ appear in τ_1. Using Claim 2 again, τ which has $\langle g(t,f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v$ as a conclusion, is obtained.

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| + 1 \tag{103}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + 1 + 1 \tag{104}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + 2 \tag{105}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||g_i(t, f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u})|| \tag{106}$$

By removing the unnecessary conclusions, the case has been shown to be valid. ⊣

LEMMA 16. *(S_2^1) Let $c(t)$ be ϵ or s_0t or s_1t or t. If*

$$f(c(t),\overline{u}) = t_{f,c}(t, f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u}) \tag{107}$$

is the defining axiom of f and $\vdash_B \langle t_{f,c}(t,f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$, then we have

$$\vdash_{B+||f(c(t),\overline{u})=t_{f,c}(t,f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u}||} \langle f(c(t),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v',\overline{\alpha}. \tag{108}$$

where $v' \trianglelefteq v$. Further, the construction does not change the premises and inferences which derive $\overline{\alpha}$.

PROOF. The lemma is proven by conducting a case analysis on the defining axiom of f.

The case in which (107) has the form

$$\epsilon^n(u_1,\ldots,u_m) = \epsilon \tag{109}$$

is valid, because by the computation rule

$$\frac{\langle\epsilon,\rho\rangle\downarrow\epsilon \quad \langle u_1,\rho\rangle\downarrow * \quad \ldots \quad \langle u_m,\rho\rangle\downarrow *}{\langle\epsilon^n(u_1,\ldots,u_m),\rho\rangle\downarrow\epsilon} \tag{110}$$

$\vdash_{f(c(t),\overline{u})=t_{f,c}(t,f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u})} \langle\epsilon^n(u_1,\ldots,u_m),\rho\rangle\downarrow\epsilon$ holds.

In the case for which (107) has the form

$$\mathrm{proj}_i^n(u_1,\ldots,u_m) = u_i \tag{111}$$

the computation rule

$$\frac{\langle u_1,\rho\rangle\downarrow *\cdots\langle u_{i-1},\rho\rangle\downarrow * \quad \langle u_i,\rho\rangle\downarrow v \quad \langle u_{i+1},\rho\rangle\downarrow *\cdots\langle u_m,\rho\rangle\downarrow *}{\langle\mathrm{proj}_i^n(u_1,\ldots,u_m),\rho\rangle\downarrow v.} \tag{112}$$

applies. By assumption, $\vdash_B \langle t_i,\rho\rangle\downarrow v$. Thus, $\vdash_{B+m} \langle\mathrm{proj}_i^n(t_1,\ldots,t_m),\rho\rangle\downarrow v$. Therefore, the case is valid.

The case for which f is defined by composition of $g, h_1,\ldots,h_m$ is presented next. Let σ be a computation of $\langle g(h_1(\overline{u}),\ldots,h_m(\overline{u}))),\rho\rangle\downarrow v$. Then, σ has the following form.

$$\frac{\overline{\beta} \qquad \dfrac{\overline{\gamma_1} \quad (\langle u_i,\rho\rangle\downarrow z_i^1)_{i\in X}}{\langle h_1(\overline{u}),\rho\rangle\downarrow w_1} \qquad \ldots}{\langle g(\overline{u}(\overline{u})),\rho\rangle\downarrow v} \tag{113}$$

where $u_i, i \in X$ are terms among $\overline{u}$ such that the a term u_i is not g-numeral. We ignore the case that $\langle h_j(\overline{t}), \rho\rangle \downarrow w_j, j = 1, \ldots, m$ is derived by $*$-rule, because for that case the proof is trivial. From σ, τ is defined as

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\overline{\beta}}{\langle g(\overline{w^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow v} \quad \dfrac{\overline{\gamma_1}}{\langle h_1(\overline{z^1}), ()\rangle \downarrow w_1} \quad \ldots \quad (\langle u_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(\overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v.} \tag{114}$$

where $z_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ are most accurate approximations among $z_i^1, \ldots, z_i^m$ and $\overline{w}^*$ are approximations of $\overline{w}$. Therefore, as $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + m + 1$, the case is valid.

The case for which f is defined by recursion using g_ϵ, g_0, g_1 is presented next. For the case of g_ϵ, the proof is similar to that of the case of the composition. Consider the case in which the defining equation is $f(s_i t, \overline{u}) = g_i(t, f(t, \overline{u}), \overline{u})$. Then, there exists a derivation σ with the value of $g_i(t, f(t, \overline{u}), \overline{u})$. It is assumed that t and $\overline{t}$ are not g-numerals. Also, w is not $*$. However, had there been a g-numeral among t and $\overline{t}$ or $w \equiv *$, the proof would be similar.

Then, σ has the following form.

$$\dfrac{\overline{\alpha} \quad \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_0^1 \qquad \dfrac{\overline{\beta} \quad \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_0^2 \quad \langle \overline{u}, \rho\rangle \downarrow \overline{z^2}}{\langle f(t, \overline{u}), \rho\rangle \downarrow w} \qquad \langle \overline{u}, \rho\rangle \downarrow \overline{z^1}}{\langle g_i(t, f(t, \overline{u})), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{115}$$

Choose $z_i, i = 1, \ldots, m$ as z_i^1 if $z_i^1 \trianglelefteq v_i^2$ and z_i^2 if otherwise. Similarly, choose z_0 as z_0^1 if $z_0^1 \trianglelefteq z_0^2$ and z_0^2 if otherwise. By Lemma 4 it is possible to transform σ into τ as shown in the diagram below.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\overline{\alpha}}{\langle g_i(z_0^*, w^*, \overline{z^*}), ()\rangle \downarrow v,} \quad \dfrac{\langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow z_0}{\langle s_i t, \rho\rangle \downarrow s_i z_0,} \quad \dfrac{\overline{\beta}}{\langle f(z_0^2, \overline{z^2}), ()\rangle \downarrow w,} \quad \langle \overline{u}, \rho\rangle \downarrow \overline{z}}{\langle f(s_i t, \overline{t}), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{116}$$

where $z_0^*, w^*, \overline{z^*}$ are approximations of $z_0.w, \overline{z}$ respectively. As $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + 4$, the lemma has been proven. ⊣

§5. Consistency proof.

PROPOSITION 1 (S_2^2). *Let U be a large integer. Let r be a tree-like* PV^- *proof which derives $t = u$ and $||r|| \leq U$. Then, for all $\forall\rho, \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$ such that $||\rho|| \leq U - ||r||$, $\rho_i \leq U - ||r||, i = 1, \ldots, k$, $\forall B \leq U - ||r||$, $\forall v, ||v|| \leq B$, and for all computation statements α such that $M(\overline{\alpha}) \leq U - ||r||$, where $M(\overline{\alpha})$ is the maximum size of main terms of $\overline{\alpha}$, and of which environments are $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$,*

$$\vdash_B \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha} \Rightarrow \vdash_{B+||r||} \langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v', \overline{\alpha} \tag{117}$$

$$\vdash_B \langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha} \Rightarrow \vdash_{B+||r||} \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v', \overline{\alpha} \tag{118}$$

hold, where $v' \trianglelefteq v$. Further, the construction does not change the premises and inferences which derive $\overline{\alpha}$.

PROOF. The proposition is proven by showing induction on r. We want to prove that if for any σ such that $\sigma \vdash \langle t, \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$ and $|||\sigma||| \leq B$ then there is a computation τ such that $\tau \vdash \langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v'$ and $|||\tau||| \leq B + ||r||$. It is possible

to bound the Gödel number of α because the maximal size of t_i and ρ_i are bounded while their number k is bounded by $|||\sigma|||$, thus U and $||r||$. Thus $T(\sigma)$ is also bounded. Thus $||\sigma||$ is bounded, too. Similarly, τ is bounded. As induction hypothesis can be written by a Π^b_2-formula, the proposition can be proven inside S^2_2. The property that the construction does not change the premises and inferences which derive $\overline{\alpha}$, can be seen easily from the proof.

The case for which the last inference of r is a defining axiom is considered first, for which r has the form

$$\overline{f(c(t),\overline{u}) = t_{f,c}(t, f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u})} \tag{119}$$

First, consider a computation σ of $\vdash_B \langle f(c(t),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$. According to Lemma 15, $\vdash_{B+||r||} \langle t_{f,c}(t, f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v',\overline{\alpha}$ for some $v' \trianglelefteq v$. We are done.

Next, consider a computation σ of $\langle t_{f,c}(t, f(t,\overline{u}),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$. Using Lemma 16, it is clear that $\vdash_{B+||r||} \langle f(c(t),\overline{u}),\rho\rangle \downarrow v',\overline{\alpha}$ for some $v' \trianglelefteq v$. We are done.

The case in which the last inference of r is a symmetry rule is trivial.

The case for which the last inference of r is a transitivity rule is considered next.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{cc}\vdots\ r_1 & \vdots\ r_2\\ t = u & u = w\end{array}}{t = w} \tag{120}$$

Let σ be a computation of $\vdash_B \langle t,\rho\rangle \downarrow v,\overline{\alpha}$. Then, according to the induction hypothesis, there is a computation τ of $\vdash_{B+||r_1||} \langle u,\rho\rangle \downarrow v',\overline{\alpha}$ for some $v' \trianglelefteq v$. Since $||\rho_1||,\ldots,||\rho_k||, M(\overline{\alpha}) \leq U - ||r|| \leq U - ||r_2||$ and $|||\tau||| \leq U - ||r|| + ||r_1|| \leq U - ||r_2||$, the induction hypothesis can be applied to r_2, which implies that there is a computation δ of $\vdash_{B+||r_1||+||r_2||} \langle w,\rho\rangle \downarrow v'',\overline{\alpha}$ for some $v'' \trianglelefteq v$. Since $B + ||r_1|| + ||r_2|| \leq B + ||r||$, the case is valid.

The case in which the last inference of r is

$$\frac{t_1 = u_1 \quad \cdots \quad t_n = u_n}{f(u_1,\ldots,u_n) = f(r_1,\ldots,r_n),} \tag{121}$$

is considered. It is assumed that $t_1 \not\equiv u_1$, whereas for the remainder of $i = 2,\ldots,n$, $t_i \equiv u_i$, because it is possible to derive the general cases by repeatedly applying this case.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ r_1\\ t_1 = u_1\end{array}}{f(t_1,t_2,\ldots,t_n) = f(u_1,t_2,\ldots,t_n)} \tag{122}$$

Assume that σ is a computation of $\langle f(t_1,\ldots,t_n),\rho\rangle \downarrow v$ and R is the inference which derives $\langle f(t_1,\ldots,t_n),\rho\rangle \downarrow v$.

CLAIM 3. *There is a computation τ which derives $\langle f(u_1,t_2,\ldots,t_m),\rho\rangle \downarrow v',\overline{\alpha}$ for some $v' \trianglelefteq v$ and $|||\tau_1|||$ is bounded by $|||\sigma||| + ||r_1|| + 1$.*

PROOF. Because the case for which R is the substitution rule, ϵ or ϵn-rule, never occurs, and the case of which R is $*$-rule is trivial, we consider other cases.

First, we consider the case that t_1 is a numeral v_1 and that R has the form

$$\frac{\beta \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{123}$$

where X are all indices i such that t_i is not a g-numeral. and β are computation statements, main terms of which consist of g-numerals or function applications to g-numerals. Let τ_1 be a computation of $\langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$. Let l be the number of successor functions in t_1. Then, $|||\tau_1||| \leq 2l+2$ because at most two inferences are required to derive $\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon$, and for each l two inferences are required (Lemma 4). Because $||v_1|| = 3l + 1$, $|||\tau_1||| \leq ||v_1|| + 1$. Because $|||\tau_1||| \leq ||v_1|| + 1 = ||t_1|| + 1 \leq ||r|| - ||r_1|| \leq U - ||r_1||$, the induction hypothesis can be applied to r_1 and the computation of $\langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$ to obtain the computation τ_1 of $\langle u_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$. According to corollary 2, if u_1 is a g-numeral, $u_1 \trianglelefteq v_1$. Because v_1 is a numeral, u_1 is also numeral and $u_1 \equiv v_1$. The computation σ is also the computation of $\langle f(u_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v$. Therefore, it is assumed that u_1 is not a g-numeral. According to the induction hypothesis, $|||\tau_1||| \leq ||v_1|| + 1 + ||r_1|| \leq ||r||$. σ is transformed to τ by replacing v_0 with u_1 and the computation τ_1 is added.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \tau_1\\ \beta, \quad \langle u_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}\end{array}}{\langle f(u_1, t_1, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{124}$$

Then, $|||\tau||| \leq |||\sigma||| + |||\tau_1||| \leq |||\sigma||| + ||r||$. The proof is complete. Next, we consider the case in which t_1 is not a g-numeral. Then, the inference which derives $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ has the form

$$\frac{\beta, \quad \langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v.} \tag{125}$$

where β are statements, main terms of which are g-numerals or function applications to g-numerals, and X is the set of indices such that $t_i, i = 2, \dots, m$ are not g-numerals. Let $\sigma_1 \vdash \langle f(t_1, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_0, \overline{\alpha}$ be the computation that is obtained from σ by making $\langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_0$ a conclusion. $|||\sigma_1||| \leq |||\sigma||| + 1 \leq U - ||r|| + 1 \leq U - ||r_1||$. Further, $\max\{||f(t_1, \dots, t_m)||, M(\overline{\alpha})\} \leq ||f(t_1, \dots, t_m)|| + M(\overline{\alpha}) \leq U - ||r|| + ||f(t_1, \dots, t_m)|| \leq U - ||r_1||$ where $M(\overline{\alpha})$ means that the maximum size of main terms in $\overline{\alpha}$. Thus, the induction hypothesis can be applied to σ_1 to obtain $\tau_1 \vdash \langle f(t_1, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \langle u, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_0, \overline{\alpha}$ which satisfies $|||\tau_1||| \leq |||\sigma_1||| + ||r_1||$. Because the transformation from σ_1 to τ_1 does not change the premises and inferences which derives $\langle f(t, t_1, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v$ in τ_1, τ_1 still have the inference

$$\frac{\beta \quad \langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1 \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(t_1, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v.} \tag{126}$$

This inference can be transformed to

$$\frac{\beta, \quad \langle u_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1, \quad (\langle t_i, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_i)_{i\in X}}{\langle f(u_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), \rho\rangle \downarrow v.} \tag{127}$$

Further, $\langle t_1, \rho\rangle \downarrow v_1$ can be removed from the the computation if it is only used in R above. Let τ be the computation which is obtained using the above method.

$$|||\tau||| \leq |||\tau_1||| \tag{128}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma_1||| + ||r_1|| \tag{129}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||r_1|| + 1 \tag{130}$$

$$\leq |||\sigma||| + ||r|| \tag{131}$$

$\dashv$

The case for which the last inference of r is a substitution rule is presented next.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ r_1\\ t = u\end{array}}{t[t_0/x] = u[t_0/x]} \tag{132}$$

By assumption, the computation σ of $\langle t[t_0/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$ where $|||\sigma||| \leq B \leq U - ||r||$ exists. According to Lemma 13, the computation σ_1 of $\vdash_{B+||t[t_0/x]||} \langle t, [t_0/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$ exists. Since $B + ||t[t_0/x]|| \leq U - ||r|| + ||t[t_0/x]|| \leq U - ||r_1||$ and $||[t_0/x]\rho|| \leq U - ||r|| + ||[t_0/x]|| \leq U - ||r_1||$, the induction hypothesis can be applied to r_1 and σ_1. Thus, the computation τ of $\vdash_{B+||t[t_0/x]||+||r_1||} \langle u, [t_0/x]\rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$ is obtained. Using Lemma 14, $\vdash_{B+||t[t_0/x]||+||r_1||+||u[t_0/x]||} \langle u[t_0/x], \rho\rangle \downarrow v, \overline{\alpha}$ is obtained. Since $B + ||t[t_0/x]|| + ||r_1|| + ||u[t_0/x]|| \leq B + ||r||$, we are done. $\dashv$

THEOREM 1 (S^2_2). PV$^-$ *is consistent.*

PROOF. Assume that there is a PV$^-$-proof of $\epsilon = s_1\epsilon$. Then, according to Proposition 1, if $\sigma \vdash \langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow v$ then there is a τ such that $\tau \vdash \langle s_1\epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow v$. Because $\langle \epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon$ is derivable by the ϵ-rule, we obtain τ such that $\tau \vdash \langle s_1\epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon$, which contradicts Lemma 1. $\dashv$

§6. Discussion.

6.1. Relation to the previous paper. This paper is revised version of [11]. This paper revises [11] in the two aspects: One is that it fixes the problem in the proof which causes Beckmann's counter example. Another is that it strengthens the meta-theory from S^1_2 to S^2_2 which is used to prove consistency of PV^-. These modification is discussed below.

6.2. Beckmann's counter example. The previous paper [11] has a counter example which is pointed by Arnold Beckmann [1]. Let $g(x)$ be the function which is defined by $g(\epsilon) = \epsilon, g(s_i x) = \overbrace{s_0 \cdots s_0}^{k} g(x)$. $h(x)$ is defined recursively by $h(\epsilon) = \epsilon, h(s_i x) = \epsilon(x, h(x))$. Then for any numeral n we have PV^--proof of $h(g(s_i n)) = \epsilon$ length of which is a constant.

$$h(g(s_i n)) = h(\overbrace{s_0 \ldots s_0}^{k} g(n)) \tag{133}$$

$$= \epsilon(\overbrace{s_0 \ldots s_0}^{k-1} g(n), h(\overbrace{s_0 \ldots s_0}^{k-1} g(n))) \tag{134}$$

$$= \epsilon \tag{135}$$

However, the computation of $h(g(s_in))$ which is defined in [11] becomes

$$\frac{\dots \quad \langle g(s_in), \rho\rangle \downarrow v_0}{\langle h(g(s_in)), \rho\rangle \downarrow v} \tag{136}$$

and the length of the computation of $g(s_in)$ rapidly increases depending to n. Because ϵ can be computed by a computation with a constant length, this contradicts Proposition 1 of [11].

This indicates that there is a gap in the proof of [11]. Indeed, the computation of $\epsilon(s_i...s_ig(n), h(s_i...s_ig(n)))$ does not have a form as (92) in the proof of Lemma 14 in [11], because it does not contain computations for neither $s_i...s_ig(n)$ nor $h(s_i...s_ig(n))$.

In this paper, we reformulate the computation rules so that they have more uniform forms. So, to compute $\epsilon(s_i...s_ig(n), h(s_i...s_ig(n)))$ we need to compute $s_i...s_ig(n)$ and $h(s_i...s_ig(n))$. Thus Proposition 1 holds for the equality (134). To make Proposition 1 holds for the equality (135), however, we introduce approximate computations, in which the value can be approximate such as $*$. By evaluating $s_i...s_ig(n)$ and $h(s_i...s_ig(n))$ to $*$, the number of the steps of a computation of $\epsilon(s_i...s_ig(n), h(s_i...s_ig(n)))$ can be bounded by a constant. Thus, Proposition 1 holds for (135). Then instead of (136) we use the computation which has a constant size.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\langle\epsilon, ()\rangle \downarrow \epsilon \quad \langle *, \rho\rangle \downarrow * \quad \langle h(*), \rho\rangle \downarrow *}{\langle \epsilon(*, h(*)), \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon} \quad \dfrac{\dfrac{}{\langle \overbrace{s_0 \cdots s_0}^{k-1}(*), ()\rangle \downarrow *} \quad \dfrac{}{\langle \overbrace{s_0 \cdots s_0}^{k}(*), ()\rangle \downarrow s_0* \quad \langle g(n), \rho\rangle \downarrow *}}{\langle g(s_in), \rho\rangle \downarrow s_0*}}{\langle h(g(s_in)), \rho\rangle \downarrow \epsilon} \tag{137}$$

Thus, we can avoid Beckmann's counter example.

6.3. Meta-theories. In this paper we strengthen the meta-theory from S^1_2 which is used in the previous paper [11], to S^2_2.

For example, in the proof of Lemma 13 if the construction of each induction step is polynomial-time, the entire construction is also polynomial-time. This is because there are at most $||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]||$ induction steps and for each induction step, the size of an input is bounded by a polynomial of $|||\sigma||| + ||t_1[u/x]|| + \cdots + ||t_m[u/x]||$. Further, in each induction step the result of induction hypothesis is used only once. Thus we can instantiate the existential quantifier in the induction formula, so we obtain induction on Π^b_1-formula not Π^b_2-formula. By this reason, Lemma 8 in [11] (which corresponds Lemma 13 of this paper) claims that the proof can be carried out in S^1_2.

However, construction of an explicit witness for $\exists$ would be complex and tedious, so in this paper we omit it. The proof which uses S^1_2 as a meta-theory is a future work.

6.4. Relation to Buss and Ignjatović's result. This paper presents proof that Buss's S^2_2 is capable of proving the consistency of purely equational PV^-, which is obtained by removing induction from PV of Cook and Urquhart, but retaining the substitution rule. Because Buss and Ignjatović stated that this is

impossible in S^1_2, at the first glance it implies that $S^1_2 \subsetneq S^2_2$. However, this is not the case.

Although they stated that S^1_2 cannot prove the consistency of purely equational PV^-, what they actually prove is that S^1_2 cannot prove the consistency of PV^- which is extended by propositional logic and $BASIC^e$ axioms. According to them, we can obtain the same unprovability for purely equational PV^- by translating propositional connectives to numerical functions. For example, $t = u$ is translated to $\mathrm{Eq}(t, u)$ where the function Eq is defined as,

$$\mathrm{Eq}(t,u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t = u \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{138}$$

and $p \vee q$ to $p \cdot q$, etc. Such a translation is possible in PV [5], but it depends on the existence of induction. For example, the reflexive law $x = x$ is translated to $\mathrm{Eq}(x, x) = 0$. It appears impossible to derive the later from the former, without using induction. Thus, our result does not appear to imply $S^1_2 \subsetneq S^2_2$.

One possibility to prove $S^1_2 \subsetneq S_2$ would be to prove a consistency a system consisting of PV^- with propositional logic and $BASIC^e$ axioms, which is the system considered by Buss and Ignjatović, in S_2. However, because our method relies on the fact that PV^- is formulated as an equational theory, our method cannot be extended to PV^- with propositional logic and $BASIC^e$ axioms. Thus, as a long-term goal, it would be interesting to develop a technique to prove the consistency of such a system in a bounded arithmetic.

Acknowledgment. The author is grateful to Arnold Beckmann, Toshiyasu Arai, Satoru Kuroda, and Izumi Takeuti for discussions and comments. The comments from an anonymous referee of Logical Methods of Computer Science is also very helpful to improve the paper. We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.jp) for English language editing.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Beckmann, *Personal communication*, 2015.

[2] A. Beckmann, *Proving consistency of equational theories in bounded arithmetic*, ***The Journal of Symbolic Logic***, vol. 67 (2002), no. 1, pp. 279–296.

[3] S. R. Buss, ***Bounded arithmetic***, Bibliopolis, 1986.

[4] S. R. Buss and A. Ignjatović, *Unprovability of consistency statements in fragments of bounded arithmetic*, ***Annals of pure and applied logic***, vol. 74 (1995), pp. 221–244.

[5] S. Cook and A. Urquhart, *Functional interpretations of feasibly constructive arithmetic*, ***Annals of pure and applied logic***, vol. 63 (1993), no. 2, pp. 103–200.

[6] G. Kahn, *Natural semantics*, ***Proceedings of the first franco-japanese symposium on programming of future generation computers*** (Amsterdam, The Netherlands, The Netherlands), Elsevier Science Publishers B. V., 1988, pp. 237–257.

[7] G. D. Plotkin, *A structural approach to operational semantics*, ***Technical report***, Computer Science Department, Aarhus University Denmark, 1981.

[8] P. Pudlák, *A note on bounded arithmetic*, ***Fundamenta mathematicae***, vol. 136 (1990), pp. 85–89.

[9] G. Takeuti, *Some relations among systems for bounded arithmetic*, ***Mathematical logic*** (PetioPetrov Petkov, editor), Springer US, 1990, pp. 139–154 (English).

[10] A. Wilkie and J. Paris, *On the scheme of induction for bounded arithmetic formulas*, ***Annals of pure and applied logic***, vol. 35 (1987), pp. 261–302.

[11] Y. Yamagata, *Consistency proof of a feasible arithmetic inside a bounded arithmetic*, ***ArXiv e-prints***, (2014) arXiv:1411.7087v2 [math.LO].

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (AIST)
1-8-31 MIDORIGAOKA, IKEDA, OSAKA 563-8577 JAPAN
URL: https://staff.aist.go.jp/yoriyuki.yamagata/en/
E-mail: yoriyuki.yamagata@aist.go.jp